

30 NOV 1982


DATE: _____



_____ *om* _____
_____ *M* _____
_____ *ly* _____
_____ *BE* _____
_____ *WPH* _____
_____ *OK* _____
_____ *hw* _____

I'M DAZZLED BY THE
ILLOGICAL LOGIC OF
YOUR ARGUMENT

REMARKS: _____



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DD/A Registry

82-2814

D/O

FYCOM 82-7059

24 November 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Committee Members

FROM:

[redacted]
Executive Assistant to the DDCI

SUBJECT: Minutes of 19 November 1982 Executive Committee Meeting: Proposed Revisions of 1) PAR; 2) Overtime Policy [redacted]

1. The Executive Committee met on 19 November to review Office of Personnel proposals to revise the Performance Appraisal Report and overtime policy. [redacted] (ExDir) chaired the session; participants included Messrs. Fitzwater (DDA); Gates (DDI); Hineman (DDS&T); George (ADDO); [redacted] (Deputy General Counsel); and Glerum (D/OP). [redacted]

2. PARs. Mr. Glerum advised the Committee that he would recommend reaffirming the present PAR system, emphasizing that a rating of "4" reflected a satisfactory performance. He also would suggest designing and testing a model containing only three levels of performance, vice the existing seven levels. Given the DCI's expressed preference for revising the current system to place less emphasis on numerical ratings and more on useful narratives, however, he offered other alternatives for consideration. First, he suggested adopting a three-level grading system of unsatisfactory (equivalent to the current 1-3), satisfactory (current 4-6), and superior (current 7). He noted that if this system were adopted, new criteria would need to be developed for awarding QSIs and SIS bonuses. A second alternative would be a two-level system--satisfactory or unsatisfactory. An optional feature could be memoranda in lieu of PARs for SIS members. Finally, Mr. Glerum said that he would like to test the third alternative, a narrative evaluation only without any numerical grades. Career Service Boards and panels would then provide rankings of employees for promotion consideration, et cetera, by assigning the existing comparative descriptor categories, I-IV. Mr. Glerum noted this would require strong linkage among Annual Work Plans, well developed standards, measurement of performance, and well understood precepts. He opined that not all parts of the Agency were presently prepared for such a system, but IMS and OCR could serve as good test beds. [redacted] recapped Mr. Glerum's suggestions, noted that PARs were a major source of employee grievances, and requested comments. [redacted]

OL 2 5403


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

3. Mr. Taylor said that the PAR had been tampered with enough and should be left essentially the way it was. He advocated striving for improved panel/board evaluations and more realistic narrative appraisals. He acknowledged that the PAR had some flaws, but noted that was unavoidable. Mr. Glerum observed that the descriptor categories had been the best addition to the evaluation process. Panels tended to achieve a better spread using them than supervisors achieve with the PAR numerical ratings. Mr. Hineman saw some merit in testing the completely narrative system and endorsed not making any changes in the PAR system in the meantime. In response to [] question, members agreed it would be a mistake to have a different PAR system for the SIS. Mr. Fitzwater recommended not revising the PAR. If some change were deemed necessary, he would favor the third alternative Mr. Glerum suggested testing. []

4. Mr. Gates observed that revising the PAR form to overcome shortcomings in the appraisal process would be an abdication of senior management responsibility. Noting that the current system could work if managers made it work, he outlined recent steps taken in his directorate to combat inflated ratings. He proposed that the Executive Director acknowledge to the DDCI/DCI the shortcomings identified in the present PAR system and suggest overcoming them by doing two things. First, senior managers should start at the top by ensuring that ratings are not inflated. Second, all regulations and policies that tend to drive ratings up--such as existing criteria for QSIs and SIS awards--should be revised. Mr. Gates also suggested that the Executive Director should point out that after a period of instability in the personnel system, employees had settled down and were focusing on the business at hand, and a new injection of instability could be counterproductive. Messrs. Hineman and George concurred with Mr. Gates' suggestions. Mr. Glerum said that standards for awards could be developed to substitute narrative justifications for the current numerical criteria that tend to drive ratings up. [] agreed to convey the group's consensus to the DDCI/DCI. []

5. Overtime Policy. Mr. Glerum reviewed the development of the existing overtime donation whereby GS-12 - GS-15 employees donate the first eight hours of overtime worked per week and presented the PMAB's recommended revision that those employees be paid for all directed overtime outside of the normally scheduled workday. Mr. George opposed the revision, saying that it would wreak havoc for the DDO overseas. [] pointed out that when the Executive Committee last considered this issue, the General Counsel affirmed the legality of existing Agency policy. He also noted that overtime pay had been the subject of only two grievance cases. After a brief discussion []

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

noted that the Committee affirmed the existing overtime donation policy. The meeting was adjourned. 

25X1

25X1

Distribution:

ExDir
DDI
DDA
DDO
DDS&T
D/Personnel
General Counsel
EXCOM Subject
EXCOM Minutes
ER